REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action mailed on June 30, 2009.

Claim 1 is are amended and no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 remain pending in this application.

§ *103 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-12, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al., U.S. 6,901,426 ("Powers"), in view of Hansen et al., U.S. 6,886,016 ("Hansen"), and in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition, Microsoft Press, 2002 ("Microsoft").

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to clarify that not only are identifiers of the first and second fields included in a tailored object class definition but also identifiers of the first and second users or groups of users and their respective associations with the first and second fields to exclude users or groups of users. The inclusion of the first and second users or groups of users and the first and second identifiers in the tailored object class definition is supported throughout the application as originally filed, such as at page 5, lines 24-30, page 11, line 16 – page 12, line 15, and FIG.s 10-12. The storing of the tailored object class definition is supported at page 8, lines 3-7.

In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully resubmits the arguments made in response to the last Office Action which are repeated below. However, Applicant further emphasizes that Powers teaches away from the asserted combination of references to provide a tailored object definition that includes data explicitly within the tailored object definition to exclude certain users or groups from performing activities with regard to fields of an object instantiated form the tailored object class definition.

In particular, the Office Action cites col. 7, lines 19-40 as teaching a portion of claim 1. However, Applicant respectfully submits that this cited portion of Powers explicitly and certainly teaches away from the subject matter of Applicant's independent claim 1. This portion of Powers provides:

> FIG. 4 illustrates details of the privilege tables 84. The
> privilege tables 84 assign each user a view and a class of
> services. The view specifies the levels and members of an
> organizational structure to which the user is allowed access.
> The class of services specifies services of the performance
> evaluation system 10 that the user is allowed to perform. The
> user has access privileges to perform services within the
> user's class of services for levels and members within the
> user's view. In this way, access privileges may be easily
> updated and maintained for the user in response to changes
> in allowed services or organizational structure. As a result,
> system administration cost is reduced.

Note that this recited paragraph states that the access privileges are stored in the privilege

tables. This same paragraph continues in the last two sentences by stating, "In this way, access

privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed

services or organizational structure. As a result, system administration cost is reduced." This

explicitly teaches away from hard coding objects with privilege data. The goal in putting the

privilege data is to reduce cost and provide an easier mechanism for making changes. Powers,

by its own text as cited by the Office Action, discourages one of skill in the art from following

the path taken by the Applicant – that path being juxtapose to the table solution of Powers by

putting privilege data in the tailored object class definition. Thus, Applicant reiterates that

Powers teaches away from the asserted combination with Hansen and Microsoft.

Also, as stated above, Applicant respectfully reiterates the arguments made in response to

the last Office Action. These arguments are as follows:

The rejection of independent claim 1 is premised on definitions of *instantiate* and *class*

with regard to object oriented design where a child object inherits properties from a parent object

as provided in Microsoft. In particular, the Office Action asserts in the *Response to Arguments*

section on page 11 that the Microsoft definitions would have motivated a combination of Hansen

and Powers where Hansen teaches tailoring an object class definition and Powers teaches the

specified user permissions. Applicant does not traverse that Hansen teaches objects or that

Powers teaches privileges. However, Applicant respectfully traverses that the combination

would have provided claim 1. Applicant further asserts that Powers teaches away from the

inventive contributions embodied in Independent claim 1.

First, if Hansen and Powers were to be combined according to the asserted motivation of

Microsoft, the combination would not have provided claim 1. For example, claim 1 is directed

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 - EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
Serial Number:10/674,327
Filing Date: September 29, 2003
Title: USER AND GROUP ACTIVITY EXCLUSION VIA OBJECT CLASS DEFINITION TAILORING

Page 8
Dkt: 2058.233US1

in part to receiving user input for tailoring an object class definition including first and second fields; first and second users or groups of users, and associations of users or groups of users to the first and second fields. As claimed, these items are all included within the tailored object class definition.

In contrast, Hansen describes objects and classes as in typical object oriented analysis and design. Powers describes user privileges stored in a table as illustrated in FIG. 4 as cited in the Office Action. The description of FIG. 4 beginning at col. 7, line 41 describes the privilege tables **84** that include a user view table **140**, a class of service assignment table **142**, and a class of service template table **144**. Further, Powers at col. 8, lines 52-53 provides, "This is used to generate a custom class of services for the user rather than a service template." However, what is missing in this combination is the embedding of the first and second users in the claimed tailored object class definition in association with the respective first and second fields as set forth in independent claim 1. Instead, the permissions of Powers are stored it the privilege tables **84** rather than in the claimed tailored object class definitions.

Thus, if Powers and Hansen were to be combined according to the asserted motivation of Microsoft, the combination would result in objects of Hansen with access privileges defined in privilege tables of Powers from which user privileges would be retrieved. Contrary to this combination, claim 1 provides a tailored object class definition including user permissions within the tailored object class definition.

Further, the embedding of user access privileges in a tailored object class definition of claim 1 is contrary to the explicit statement of Powers at col. 7, lines 37-39 which provides, "In this way, access privileges may be easily updated and maintained for the user in response to changes in allowed services or organizational structure." The ease of updating and maintaining in Powers is provided though maintenance of privileges in tables rather than in code. Maintaining privileges in the tailored object class definitions would not provide tables from which user privileges could be updated through simple database update techniques. Instead, tailored object class definitions would need to be updated in the event privileges needed to be modified. One of skill in the relevant art would readily realize that this is a more time consuming, labor intensive process. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that not only would the proposed combination of Powers and Hansen as motivated by Microsoft fail to provide claim

1, Powers discourages one of ordinary skill in art from taking the direction chosen by Applicants of defining tailored object classes with permissions data embedded therein.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 is patentable over the asserted combination of Powers and Hansen as motivated by Microsoft. Claims 3-9, 11-12, and 14-16 depend, directly or indirectly, from patentable independent claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al., U.S. 6,901,426 ("Powers"), in view of Hansen et al., U.S. 6,886,016 ("Hansen"), in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary Fifth Edition, Microsoft Press, 2002 ("Microsoft"), and in view of Keinsley et al., U.S. 2003/0154403 ("Keinsley").

Keinsley is provided for purposes of showing the additional elements of claim 10. However, Keinsley fails to cure the deficiencies with regard to independent claim 1 from which claim 10 depends. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is also patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1.

Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections and allowance of claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are respectfully requested.

Amendment After Final

Applicant has amended claim 1 after a final rejection in response to the Examiner's assertion in the Response to Arguments section that the claim previously did not recite that the first and second user or group of users are embedded in the object class definition. Although Applicant believes that the claim inherently provided so, Applicant has amended the claim to be more concise. Applicant respectfully requests entry and consideration of the amendment on the grounds that doing so would not impose an undue burden on the Examiner as the Office Action already contemplated such a reading of the claim. For example, on page 11 of the Office Action in the Response to Arguments section, the Examiner considered such a reading of the previous claim language. Thus, entry and consideration of amended independent claim 1 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-12, and 14-16 are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (612) 373-6938 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938
(408) 278-4041

Date   8/31/2009   By   /   /
                                         James D. Hallenbeck
                                         Reg. No. 63,561

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 31st day of August, 2009.

Dawn R. Shaw   /Dawn R. Shaw/

Name   Signature